REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-13 and 15-20 are pending in the present application.

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed July 25, 2006. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-9, 10-13 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicant has amended claims 7-10, 12, 15-17, and added claims 18-20. Applicant submits that the newly added claims introduce no new matter.

Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5 and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S Patent No. 5,016,009 issued to Whiting et al. ("Whiting"), in view of U.S. No. 4,398,176 issued to Dargel et al. ("Dargel"). The Examiner also rejected claims 7-9 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S Patent No. 5,016,009 issued to Whiting et al. ("Whiting"), in view of U.S. No. 4,398,176 issued to Dargel et al. ("Dargel"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,450,599 issued to Horvarth et al. ("Horvarth").

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for the following reasons:

Whiting discloses an input FIFO 232, a circuit diagram 228, and a compression control sequencing unit 230 (Fig. 7). The input FIFO is implemented as register within an integrated circuit to facilitate data movement and packing (Col 17, lines 60-63). The circuit diagram is controlled by the compression and sequencing unit. Unlike the present invention where a control circuitry that is coupled to and controls the input circuit, Whiting discloses a compression and sequencing unit that controls a

circuit diagram and is not directly coupled to an input FIFO (see Fig. 7, Col. 17 (lines 60-63). Also unlike the present invention, Whiting does not discloses the encoded data that is embedded in a bit stream with different standards and that a paser is used to prepare plurality of stages for processing different portions of the bit stream corresponding to different ones of the different standards.

Dargel discloses a plurality of stages and a master controller. Each stage includes a processor portion for analyzing the pixel values in the image and a memory portion communicating with the processor portion for sequencing providing a window of neighboring pixels to the processor for analysis. The controller communicates with the pipeline of stages over a single communication line which provides both the pixel values to the pipeline and transformation control instruction to the processor portion of the stages. Dargel, however, does not discloses encoded data that is embedded in a bit stream with different standards and that a paser is used to prepare the plurality of stages for processing different portions of the bit stream corresponding to different ones of the different standards.

Horvarth discloses encoding (compression), uncompressed source images are initially stores in an image memory.... The encode process is controlled by the LSM. Prior to initiating the encoding of a block data, the LSM reads the input FIFO to retrieve a block header. The header, containing CODEC control information is then stored in a control register and applied to the CODEC. No where in Horvarth that discloses encoded data that is embedded in a bit stream with different standards and that a paser is used to prepare the plurality of stages for processing different portions of the bit stream corresponding to different ones of the different standards.

Whiting, Dargel, and Horvarth, taken alone or in any combination, do not disclose, suggest, or render obvious encoded data that is embedded in a bit stream with different standards and that a paser is used to prepare the plurality of stages for processing different portions of the bit stream corresponding to different ones of the different standards. This aspect of the invention is supported in the specification on page 16b (line 28-32), page 16g (lines 30-34), page 83 (Table 600), page 84 (lines 30-32), page 86 (line 1) to page 94 (line 27), and is recited in amended claims 1 and 10.

Therefore, Applicant believes that independent claims 1, 10 and their respective dependent claims are distinguishable over the cited prior art references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks made above, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully solicited. If it is believed that a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of the present application, or clarify matters with regard to its allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any required fees associated with this Communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 04-1175.

Respectfully submitted,

DISCOVISION ASSOCIATES

Dated: 09/22/06

Caroline T. Do, Esq.
Reg. No. 47,529

DISCOVISION ASSOCIATES
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT
2265 E. 220th Street
Long Beach, CA 90810
(310) 952-3300

P:\ABG\PPD\PDD\941004--\(EP)US\C1X\C1\D11\AMENDMENT_04_AF.DOC